

SM



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/698,893	10/27/2000	Morey Kraus	07588-008001	5973

7590 03/09/2004

Paul T. Clark
Clark & Elbing, LLP
101 Federal Street
Boston, MA 02110

EXAMINER

FALK, ANNE MARIE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1632

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/698,893

Applicant(s)

KRAUS ET AL.

Examiner

Anne-Marie Falk, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1632

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 04 December 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☒ A Notice of Appeal was filed on 02 January 2004. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: 47.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-11, 13-17, 19-21, 25, 27, 29-37, 40, 41 and 44-46.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 12, 22-24, 42 and 43.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet

Anne-Marie Falk
Anne-Marie Falk, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1632

Art Unit: 1632

Continuation of 2. NOTE:

The proposed claim amendments, if entered, would require multiple new grounds of rejection.

For example, Claims 13, 14, and 15 would be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, because although these claim are marked with the status identifier "Original" the claims have been amended by adding the word "said" so that the claims now read "wherein said the improvement" which is not grammatically correct and renders the claim language confusing.

As a second example, Claim 13 would be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the instant case, Claim 13 recites the broad recitation "repair of central nervous system damage", and the claim also recites "causing an improvement in function of the central nervous system of a subject having impaired central nervous system function resulting from a stroke" which is the narrower statement of the limitation.

As a third example, Claim 14 would be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

Art Unit: 1632

regards as the invention. A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the instant case, Claim 14 recites the broad recitation "repair of central nervous system disease", and the claim also recites "causing an improvement in function of the central nervous system of a subject having impaired central nervous system function resulting from a stroke" which is the narrower statement of the limitation.

As a fourth example, Claim 15 would be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte*

Art Unit: 1632

Hasche, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the instant case, Claim 15 recites the broad recitation “regeneration of central nervous system tissue”, and the claim also recites “causing an improvement in function of the central nervous system of a subject having impaired central nervous system function resulting from a stroke” which is the narrower statement of the limitation.

As a fifth example, Claim 17 would be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 17 recites the limitation “wherein the improvement is the result of stroke repair” which does not further limit the independent claims.

Additional rejections would be required.

Continuation of 5. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

See above.

Since the proposed amendments have not been entered for the reasons detailed above, Claims 1-11, 13-17, 19-21, 25, 27, 29-37, 40, 41, and 44-46 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for reasons of record.

Claim 45 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for reasons of record, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 1-11, 13-17, 19-21, 25, 27, 29-37, 40, 41, 45, and 46 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for reason of record, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 1632

Claim 47 remains objected to as depending from a rejected base claim.

The instant reply does not constitute a complete reply to the final rejection as no action has been taken with regard to withdrawn claims 12, 22-24, 42, and 43. See page 6 of the Office Action mailed 7/1/03 which states:

This application contains claims 12, 22-24, 42, and 43 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in Paper No. 8. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancelation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144). See MPEP § 821.01.

Continuation of 10. Other:

The Information Disclosure Statement filed 12/4/03 has not been considered because the necessary fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p) has not been paid..